## REMARKS

In the above-identified Office Action the Examiner rejected Claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. 112 on the grounds that the term "first optical means" as set forth in Claim 1 is "not specific enough as to what or which element of the optical means Applicant regard as invention". In response, Claim 1 has been further amended to state that the first optical means has a power in the sub-scanning direction. Moreover, Claim 1 also states that the first optical means is inserted between the object and imaging means of the apparatus described in that claim. Looking, for example, to the first embodiment of Applicants' invention as described with respect to Fig. 6 of the drawings, the first optical means corresponds to element 2 which is described at Page 14 of the Specification as having positive power in a sub-scanning direction. Also, as disclosed in Fig. 6, element 2 is disposed between the object 1 and the imaging means 4. For these reasons, and in view of the additional language added to Claim 1 in the foregoing amendment thereto, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. 112 has been overcome.

Claims 1 and 10 through 18 were also rejected as being anticipated by the previously cited Fujimoto patent. In this regard, Applicants stress that the Fujimoto patent fails as a rejecting reference with respect to independent Claim 1 for two reasons. That is, although Fujimoto discloses "first optical means inserted in a second optical path between the object and said imaging means" as required in the last clause of Claim 1, wherein that element is the mirror 102 as relied upon by the Examiner, that mirror (1) cannot be used for "temporarily imaging the object in a sub-scanning direction", and that mirror (2) does not have "a power in the sub-scanning direction". Accordingly, neither of these claimed requirements (1) and (2) from Claim 1 can be accomplished by the mirror 102 in Fujimoto.

Instead of temporarily imaging the object, the mirror 102 in Fujimoto merely serves as a reflector. Also, the mirror 102 in Fujimoto does not provide any converging or diverging power, which function has now been ascribed to the first optical means in amended Claim 1, wherein that claim now requires that "said first optical means has a power in the sub-scanning direction".

For these various reasons Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims are patentably distinct over Fujimoto, wherefore the issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is solicited in this application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 24,613

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO 30 Rockefeller Plaza New York, New York 10112-3801

Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY\_MAIN 359160v1